

Drawing Amendments

The attached sheets of drawings include changes to FIG. 1. These sheets replace the original sheets.

Attachment: Replacement sheets.

REMARKS

Applicant expresses appreciation to the Examiner for consideration of the subject patent application. This amendment is in response to the Office Action mailed June 20, 2006. Claims 10-23 were rejected. The claims have been amended to address the concerns raised by the Examiner.

Claims 1-44 were originally presented. Claims 10-23 remain in the application. Claims 10, 12, 13, and 22 have been amended. Please cancel claims 24-44.

Drawing Objections

The drawings were objected to under 37 C.F.R. § 1.83(a) for not showing every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, as shown on the enclosed replacement sheet, FIG. 1 has been amended, without adding new matter.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 10-23 stand rejected under § 112, 2nd paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Specifically, Applicant has amended the claims to overcome these rejections.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 10-14 and 16-23 (including independent claim 10) were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Howard (US 3,983,646) in view of Benderly (US 6,422,037).

Howard teaches adhering two metallic disks together. Benderly teaches an engraved gold metal disk. The combination of Howard and Benderly only teaches adhering two precious metal (gold) disks together where one of the precious metal disks is engraved.

In contrast, the present invention claims a first precious layer of material that is made using a mass production technique such as stamping, molding or cloisonné. The precious metal disk of the present invention is **not** engraved. Precious metal is gold, silver, or platinum.

The precious metal disks of the present invention are made using mass production techniques and not using custom engraving as in Benderly. Mass production techniques are only

useful if large quantities of coins or disks are desired to be made. This is because mass production techniques have significant setup costs and a relatively large number of stamped coins generally are made in order to make the setup costs worthwhile (e.g., 1000 coins). Mass production can produce an excellent final result for the precious metals. Whereas, it can be difficult to laser engrave very shiny and reflective materials such as gold, silver or platinum without using very expensive laser equipment.

This means that someone who desires to make just one precious metal customized coin where each coin is individually customized may not be able to because of the manufacturing setup costs and the multiple copies of the coin which are typically made. Thus, it is not generally feasible to manufacture a single custom coin or a few coins with the molding or stamping manufacturing methods. Alternatively, the end user can purchase a very expensive laser to engrave the precious metals which is not generally cost effective either.

The present invention combines the best of both worlds, namely mass manufacturing and custom lasering with low power lasers. The second layer of the coin has been amended to claim a non-precious metal that is affixed to the precious metal with an adhesive layer. The combination of Howard and Benderly does not provide a combination of mass produced precious metal with a custom engraved non-precious metal layer. In addition, the prior art of Howard and Benderly does not suggest the combination of layers manufactured using these two different processes.

Rejection of the dependent claims 11-23 should be reconsidered and withdrawn for at least the reasons given above with respect to the independent claims. The dependent claims, being narrower in scope, are allowable for at least the reasons for which the independent claims is/are allowable.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 10-23 are allowable, and urges the Examiner to withdraw the rejection.

CONCLUSION

In light of the above, Applicant respectfully submits that pending claims 10-23 are now in condition for allowance. Therefore, Applicant requests that the rejections and objections be withdrawn, and that the claims be allowed and passed to issue. If any impediment to the allowance of these claims remains after entry of this Amendment, the Examiner is strongly encouraged to call Steve M. Perry at (801) 566-6633 so that such matters may be resolved as expeditiously as possible.

Fees in the amount of \$225.00 will be submitted electronically pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.17(a) for a two month extension of time pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.136. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fee or to credit any overpayment in connection with this Amendment to Deposit Account No. 20-0100.

DATED this 20th day of November, 2006.

Respectfully submitted,

/Steve M. Perry/

Steve M. Perry
Registration No. 45,357

THORPE NORTH & WESTERN, LLP
Customer No. 20,551
P.O. Box 1219
Sandy, Utah 84091-1219
Telephone: (801) 566-6633